UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,138	04/15/2004	Kei MURAYAMA	040170	3137

23850 7590 03/05/2007

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER	
BAREFORD, KATHERINE A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1762	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/709,138	MURAYAMA, KEI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katherine A. Bareford	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 January 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,7 and 9-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Claims 2, 5, 6 and 8 are canceled

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment of January 25, 2007 has been received and entered.

With the amendment, claims 2, 5, 6 and 8 remain canceled, and claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9-12 remain pending for examination.

Interview

2. The Examiner notes that the file contains a draft amendment filed July 24, 2006 that refers to an interview to be held July 26, 2006. However, the file does not contain information that this interview was held, and the amendment of September 25, 2006 contains no reference to this interview.

The Examiner thanks applicant for the description (at page 5 in the Remarks section of the January 25, 2007 amendment) of the telephone interview of August 3, 2006.

Claim Objections

3. The objection to claim 12 because of informalities is withdrawn, because in the amendment of January 25, 2007, applicant has amended claim 12, line 2, to change "small" to "smaller" for correct grammar.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 11-13, "the oxidizing agent is selectively coated in portions, which are smaller than both a predetermined dimension and the space portion, out of the space portion between the electrodes of the conductive pattern" is confusing as worded. The "portions, which are smaller than both a predetermined dimension and the space portion" is confusing as to what is meant by "smaller than . . . the space portion". At lines 10-11 it is indicated that "the space portion between the electrodes . . . has a plurality of different dimensions", which appears to indicate that "the space portion" size is the total of all spaces that are between electrodes in the conductive pattern. If applicant is referring to a specific distance between specific applied electrodes, this is not claimed (for example, applicant has not claimed a plurality of space portions, but rather a single space portion with a plurality of dimensions). Furthermore, from a reading of the specification, it is unclear if there is support for coating an oxidizing agent selectively in a specific space smaller than the distance between the two applied electrodes in that particular space. Applicant has not clarified what is referred to or where support for this amendment is provided in the specification.

Claim 11, last three lines, "the protection film is formed selectively in portions, which are smaller than both a predetermined dimension and the space portion, out of the space portion between the electrodes of the conductive pattern" is confusing as worded. The "portions, which are smaller than both a predetermined dimension and the space portion" is confusing as to what is meant by "smaller than . . . the space portion". At lines 9-11 it is indicated that "the space portion between the electrodes . . . has a plurality of different dimensions", which appears to indicate that "the space portion" size is the total of all spaces that are between electrodes in the conductive pattern. If applicant is referring to a specific distance between specific applied electrodes, this is not claimed (for example, applicant has not claimed a plurality of space portions, but rather a single space portion with a plurality of dimensions). Furthermore, from a reading of the specification, it is unclear if there is support for coating a protection film selectively in a specific space smaller than the distance between the two applied electrodes in that particular space (see figures 2C-2D and paragraphs [0044]—[0045]). Applicant has not clarified what is referred to or where support for this amendment is provided in the specification.

The other dependent claims do not cure the defects of the claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al (US 5167992) in view of the admitted state of the prior art, EP 837 623 (hereinafter '623) and Miller (US 4668533).

Lin teaches a method of electroless plating. Column 1, lines 5-10. A substrate is prepared that has an insulating body and a conductive pattern formed on the insulating body. Column 3, lines 45-55 and column 4, lines 30-50. The substrate is to be used for microelectronic interconnect substrates or circuit boards. Column 3, lines 45-55. A catalytic metal serving as a catalyst of an electroless plating process is adhered onto the insulating body and the conductive pattern. Column 5, lines 35-60. An oxidizing agent, which can oxidize the catalytic metal and make the catalytic metal in an inactive state to the electroless plating is applied to the catalytic metal. Column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 20 and column 7, lines 25-35. It would be applied in a space portion S between the conductive pattern features (as it is shown being applied to the entire surface). Column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 20. Then a metal layer is selectively formed on the conductive pattern by electroless plating. Column 6, lines 20-30.

Claim 4: the adhering of the catalytic metal onto the insulating body and the conductive pattern includes coating an activating solution containing ions of the catalytic metal to deposit the catalytic metal by an oxidation reduction reaction. Column 5, lines 50-60 and column 7, lines 20-25.

Claim 7: the catalytic metal is palladium. Column 5, lines 45-60. The metal formed by electroless plating can be a nickel layer. Column 6, lines 20-40.

Claim 10: the oxidizing agent can be sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4). Column 7, lines 20-30.

Lin teaches all the features of these claims except that (1) the conductive pattern includes electrodes, (2) the space portion between the electrodes has a plurality of different dimensions, (3) that the oxidizing agent is coated selectively so that the oxidizing agent is formed selectively in portions, which are smaller than a predetermined dimension and the space portion, out of the space portion between the electrodes, (4) the ink jet application of the oxidizing agent, (5) the space portion of less than 30 microns (claim 12).

The admitted state of the prior art teaches that when forming wiring substrates with conductive patterns, it is well known for the wiring patterns to include electrodes formed of copper which then are overplated to enhance reliability. See paragraphs [0002]—[0008] of the specification. It is also well known for the pitch of the copper electrodes on the wiring substrate to be narrowed to 60 microns or less. See paragraph [0004] of the specification. It is also well known for the space portions between the copper electrodes to vary over the substrate. See paragraph [0006] of the specification.

It is also well known to desire to form a nickel layer selectively on the copper electrodes by electroless plating. See paragraphs [0002]—[0008] of the specification.

'623 teaches that it is well known to overplate by electroless plating selectively over conductive patterns on a insulating substrate when making printed circuit boards, for example. Column 1, lines 1-10 and column 4, lines 35-45. The overcoating can be nickel based resistors. Column 7, lines 1-15. '623 provides providing a conductive circuit pattern on the insulating substrate. Column 4, lines 35-55. Then the surfaces of the conductive pattern and the substrate are activated. Column 4, lines 50-55 and column 6, lines 30-45. Then '623 provides applying a plating mask onto the activated substrate so that the areas to be plated are defined in a negative manner, where the plating mask covers all or substantially all of the surfaces except for the resistor areas to be plated. Column 6, lines 45-55. The area to be plated can be partially over the conductive pattern and partially over the insulating substrate. Column 6, lines 50-56. Then, electroless plating occurs, with plating occurring only on the areas not covered by the mask. Column 7, lines 1-15. The exact size of the resistor area to be plated can vary. Column 7, lines 20-30.

Miller teaches ink jet printing as a method to apply materials for electroless plating in a selective form, such as the sensitizers and activators. Column 2, lines 40-50, column 3, lines 45-60 and column 4, lines 15-30. The substrate can be an active integrated circuit. Column 3, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to (1), (2) and (5) modify Lin to provide that the conductive pattern includes electrodes spaced different distances apart and that these electrodes can be less than 60 microns apart as suggested by the admitted state of the prior art in order to provide a desirable circuit and microelectronic pattern because Lin teaches forming conductive patterns on insulating substrates for circuit and microelectronic usage, and the admitted state of the prior art teaches that conductive patterns on wiring substrates for such purposes conventionally have copper electrodes spaced different distances apart and that the electrodes can be less than 60 microns apart. It further would have been obvious to perform routine experimentation to optimize the distance apart to less than 30 microns apart as the admitted state of the prior art provides that less than 60 microns apart is conventional. (3) (4) It further would have been obvious to modify Lin in view of the admitted state of the prior art to apply the oxidizing agent selectively to the non electrode portions (so that not all of the non-electrode portions are contacted with oxidizing agent) by a method such as ink jet printing as suggested by '623 and Miller in order to provide a further desirable selective overplating, as Lin in view of the admitted state of the prior art teaches to apply oxidizing agent to an entire surface so that non-conductive surfaces are not coated and '623 teaches that when overplating, there are times when it is desired to have coating over some of the non-conductive areas as well, and Miller provides a desirable method for selectively applying materials for electroless plating to particular parts of the substrate is by ink jet printing. As this

method would apply oxidizing agent in a predetermined pattern to some parts of the non-conductive surface and not apply oxidizing agent to other parts, oxidizing agent would be formed selectively in portions, which are smaller than a predetermined dimension, out of the space portion between the electrodes as claimed. As well, the oxidizing agent would be coated in a portion which is smaller than the overall "space portion" (all the areas between all the electrodes), because some space portion would not be coated with oxidizing agent.

8. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 837 623 (hereinafter '623) in view of the admitted state of the prior art.

'623 teaches that it is well known to overplate by electroless plating selectively over conductive patterns on a insulating substrate when making printed circuit boards, for example. Column 1, lines 1-10 and column 4, lines 35-45. The overcoating can be nickel based resistors. Column 7, lines 1-15. '623 provides providing a conductive circuit pattern on the insulating substrate. Column 4, lines 35-55. Then the surfaces of the conductive pattern and the substrate are activated by applying a catalytic metal serving as a catalyst for electroless plating. Column 4, lines 50-55 and column 6, lines 30-45. Then '623 provides applying a plating mask (protection film) onto the activated substrate so that the areas to be plated are defined in a negative manner, where the plating mask covers all or substantially all of the surfaces except for the resistor areas to be plated. Column 6, lines 45-55. The area to be plated can be partially over the

conductive pattern and partially over the insulating substrate. Column 6, lines 50-56. Then, electroless plating occurs, with plating occurring only on the areas not covered by the mask. Column 7, lines 1-15. The exact size of the resistor area to be plated can vary. Column 7, lines 20-30.

Claim 9: the plating mask can be any typical plating mask known in the art. Column 6,lines 55-60.

It is the Examiner's position that resist films are well known in the art of electroless plating as plating masks. As applicant has not traversed this statement from the October 31, 2006 Office Action, it is understood to be agreed to.

'623 teaches all the features of these claims except that (1) the conductive pattern includes electrodes, (2) the space portion between the electrodes has a plurality of different dimensions, (3) that the protection film is coated selectively so that the protection film is formed selectively in portions, which are smaller than a predetermined dimension and the space portion, out of the space portion between the electrodes, (4) the protection film material (claim 12).

The admitted state of the prior art teaches that when forming wiring substrates with conductive patterns, it is well known for the wiring patterns to include electrodes formed of copper which then are overplated to enhance reliability. See paragraphs [0002]—[0008] of the specification. It is also well known for the pitch of the copper electrodes on the wiring substrate to be narrowed to 60 microns or less. See paragraph [0004] of the specification. It is also well known for the space portions between the

copper electrodes to vary over the substrate. See paragraph [0006] of the specification. It is also well known to desire to form a nickel layer selectively on the copper electrodes by electroless plating. See paragraphs [0002] – [0008] of the specification.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to (1) (2) modify '623 to provide that the conductive pattern includes electrodes spaced different distances apart as suggested by the admitted state of the prior art in order to provide a desirable circuit pattern because '623 teaches forming conductive patterns on insulating substrates for circuit usage, and the admitted state of the prior art teaches that conductive patterns on wiring substrates for such purposes conventionally have copper electrodes spaced different distances apart. (3) It further would have been obvious to modify '623 in view of the admitted state of the prior art to apply the protection film selectively to the non electrode portions (so that not all of the non-electrode portions are contacted with film) in order to provide a further desirable selective overplating, as '623 teaches that when overplating, there are times when it is desired to have coating over some of the non-conductive areas as well. As this method would apply the protection film in a predetermined pattern to some parts of the non-conductive surface and not apply protection film to other parts, protection film would be formed selectively in portions, which are smaller than a predetermined dimension, out of the space portion between the electrodes as claimed. As well, the protection film would be coated in a portion which is smaller than the overall "space portion" (all the areas between all the electrodes), because some space

portion would not be coated with protection film. (4) it would further have been obvious to modify '623 in view of the admitted state of the prior art to use a resist film as the protection film material with an expectation of desirable coating results, because '623 teaches to use any typical plating mask known in the art, and it is the Examiner's position that a resist film is well known in the art as a plating mask.

9. The Examiner notes that Farooq et al (US 5549808) provides for coating a protection film (resist 27) in spaces between a conductive pattern (see copper 18) such that the resulting protective film is selectively formed in a portion smaller than the spaces, allowing overplating that coats both the conductive traces and a portion of the space (see figure 13 and layer 23, for example).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed January 25, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant argues, as to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10 and 12 using Lin view of the admitted state of the prior art, '623 and Miller, that none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests that the oxidizing agent is selectively coated in portions, which are smaller than both a predetermined dimension and the space portion, out of the space portion between the electrodes of the conductive pattern, as in the present invention. Applicant argues that, in particular, "the oxidizing agent or the

protective film should be formed in the space portions which are smaller than predetermined space portions where the electric short-circuit may easily occur" and that none of the references teaches, mentions or suggests this short circuit problem or solution.

The Examiner has reviewed these arguments, however, the rejection is maintained. Applicant appears to be arguing that the references do not teach or suggest applying the oxidizing agent specifically in spaces measured between conductive electrodes that are less than 30 microns (or other predetermined dimensions) in order to prevent short circuits. However, this is not what is claimed. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As discussed above in the 35 USC 112 rejection, as worded in the claims, "the space portion" is described as the space portion between electrodes of the conductive pattern and "has a plurality of different dimensions". As described, therefore, the claimed "space portion" is referring to the size of space that is the total of all spaces that are between electrodes in the conductive pattern. Therefore, the suggestion of coating a protective material to provide masking (in this case the oxidizing agent) provided by the combination of references would be on an area that is smaller than both a "predetermined dimension" (smaller than the overall size of the substrate, for example) and smaller than "the space portion", because some of the overall space portion would

not be coated or masked with the material (since plating is desired on this area). Furthermore, prevention of short circuits is also not mentioned in the claims.

(B) Applicant argues, as to the rejection of claims 9 and 11 using '623 view of the admitted state of the prior art, that none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests the features of claim 1 for the reasons cited as to claim 1 above, and that claim 11 has been similarly amended.

The Examiner has reviewed these arguments, however, the rejection is maintained. As discussed in section (A) above, Applicant appears to be arguing that the references do not teach or suggest applying the protective film specifically in spaces measured between conductive electrodes that are less than 30 microns (or other predetermined dimensions) in order to prevent short circuits. However, this is not what is claimed. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As discussed above in the 35 USC 112 rejection, as worded in the claims, "the space portion" is described as the space portion between electrodes of the conductive pattern and "has a plurality of different dimensions". As described, therefore, the claimed "space portion" is referring to the size of space that is the total of all spaces that are between electrodes in the conductive pattern. Therefore, the suggestion of coating a protective material to provide masking provided by the combination of references would be on an area that is smaller than both a "predetermined dimension" (smaller than the overall size of the substrate, for

example) and smaller than "the space portion", because some of the overall space portion would not be coated or masked with the material (since plating is desired on this area). Furthermore, prevention of short circuits is also not mentioned in the claims.

Interview

11. As to the requested interview if the amendment did not place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner did not have time before this Office Action was required to be provided and mailed to provide for an interview based on the above discussed reasons for maintaining the rejection. Moreover, the Examiner believes that the issues were not ripe for interview because applicant would not have been able to see and review the Examiner's response to the January 25, 2007 arguments before an interview, thus making for a confusing interview and discussion of the case. If after review of this Office Action applicant still desires an interview, applicant is requested to contact the Examiner at the contact number provided in the ***Conclusion*** section below.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine A. Bareford whose telephone number is (571) 272-1413. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(6:00-3:30) with the First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Other inquiries can be directed to the Tech Center 1700 telephone number at (571) 272-1700.

Furthermore, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KATHERINE BAREFORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER